

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached eight drawing sheets include changes to Figures 2A, 6, 8, 8A, 9, 16A, 16B, and 17B. These eight drawing sheets replace the previous drawing sheets that included Figures 2A, 6, 8, 8A, 8B, 9, 16A, 16B, 17A, and 17B.

In Figure 2A, the label "051" has been changed to "OS1". Also, the label "052" has been changed to "OS2".

In Figure 6, the lead line arrow corresponding to reference number 174 has been moved to point at "_monitorDescription=Example transaction of 5 steps".

In Figure 8, within operation 208, the word "TIME" has been changed to "TYPE".

In Figure 8A, the label "NOT RECOGNIZED" has been added above the arrow that begins on the left side of operation 244.

In Figure 9, a duplicate reference number "76" along with its corresponding lead line arrow have been removed.

In Figure 16A, a reference number "750" along with its corresponding lead line have been added.

In Figure 16B, a reference number "750" along with its corresponding lead line have been added.

In Figure 17B, a reference number "1020" along with its corresponding lead line arrow have been added.

Attachment: 8 Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 31-56, 59-70 and 72-77 are rejected. Claims 31-56, 59-70 and 72-77 are pending. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the remarks set forth below. Applicants believe that the amendments herein to the application do not add new matter to it.

Title Objection

The present Office Action alleges that: "The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed." Applicant respectfully submits that the title as herein amended renders this objection moot.

Active Hyperlink Objection

The present Office Action alleges that: "Use of active hyperlink and/or other forms of browser executable code is improper (see MPEP 608.01) and must be removed". Applicants respectfully submit that the hyperlinks within the present application are not intended to be active links. Instead, Applicants respectfully submit that the hyperlinks within the present application are exemplary Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) that are presented to illustrate URL utilization within various embodiments in accordance with the invention.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 31-56, 59-70, and 72-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Dantressangle, U.S. Patent No. 6,446,120 (hereinafter Dantressangle).

CLAIMS 31-52

Applicant respectfully contends that Dantressangle fails to teach subject matter recited in amended independent Claim 31. For instance, amended Claim 31 recites in part (emphasis added):

developing a test configuration file for testing said web site from said formatted message, said test configuration file comprises an automatic scheduling for testing said web site that is to be tested by said web transaction test, said automatic scheduling comprises scheduling window information and test repetition information.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Dantressangle does not teach the test configuration file comprises an automatic scheduling for testing the web site, wherein the automatic scheduling comprises scheduling window information and test repetition information as explicitly recited in amended Claim 31. For example, Applicants respectfully contend that Dantressangle fails to teach the automatic scheduling comprises scheduling window information and test repetition information. Since Dantressangle fails to teach at least one element recited in amended Claim 31, Applicants respectfully contends that Dantressangle cannot anticipate amended Claim 31. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submits that amended Claim 31 is allowable over Dantressangle.

Additionally, since Claims 32-52 depend from amended independent Claim 31, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 32-52 derive patentability at least therefrom.

CLAIM 53

Applicant respectfully contends that Dantressangle fails to teach subject matter recited in amended independent Claim 53. For instance, amended Claim 53 recites in part (emphasis added):

automatically developing a test configuration file from said formatted message, said test configuration file for testing said web site, said test configuration file comprises an automatic scheduling for testing said web site that is to be tested by said web transaction test, said automatic scheduling comprises scheduling window information and test repetition information.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Dantressangle does not teach the test configuration file comprises an automatic scheduling for testing the web site, wherein the automatic scheduling comprises scheduling window information and test repetition information as specifically recited in amended Claim 53. For example, Applicants respectfully contend that Dantressangle fails to teach the automatic scheduling comprises scheduling window information and test repetition information. Since Dantressangle fails to teach at least one element recited in amended Claim 53, Applicants respectfully contends that Dantressangle cannot anticipate amended Claim 53. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submits that amended Claim 53 is allowable over Dantressangle.

CLAIM 54

Applicant respectfully contends that Dantressangle does not teach subject matter recited in amended independent Claim 54. For instance, amended Claim 54 recites in part (emphasis added):

automatically developing a test configuration file from said formatted message, wherein said test configuration file comprises an automatic scheduling for testing the web site that is to be tested by said web transaction test, said automatic scheduling comprises scheduling window information and test repetition information.

Applicant respectfully contends that Dantressangle fails to teach the test configuration file comprises an automatic scheduling for testing the web site, wherein the automatic scheduling comprises scheduling window information and test repetition information as specifically recited in amended Claim 54. For example, Applicants respectfully asserts that Dantressangle fails to teach the automatic scheduling comprises scheduling window information and test repetition information. Since Dantressangle does not teach at least one element recited in amended Claim 54, Applicants respectfully contends that Dantressangle cannot anticipate amended Claim 54. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submits that amended Claim 54 is allowable over Dantressangle.

CLAIMS 55, 56, 59-70, and 72-76

Applicant respectfully contends that Dantressangle fails to teach subject matter recited in amended independent Claim 55. For instance, amended Claim 55 recites in part (emphasis added):

develop a test configuration file from said formatted message, wherein said test configuration file is for performing said web transaction test for testing said web site, said test configuration file comprises an automatic scheduling for testing said web site, said automatic scheduling includes scheduling window information and test repetition information.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Dantressangle fails to teach the test configuration file comprises an automatic scheduling for testing the web site, wherein the automatic scheduling includes scheduling window information and test repetition information as explicitly recited in amended Claim 55. For example, Applicants respectfully contends that Dantressangle fails to teach the automatic scheduling comprises scheduling window information and test repetition information. Since Dantressangle does not teach at least one element recited in amended Claim 55, Applicants respectfully contends that Dantressangle cannot anticipate amended Claim 55. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submits that amended Claim 55 is allowable over Dantressangle.

Furthermore, since Claims 56, 59-70, and 72-76 depend from amended independent Claim 55, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 56, 59-70, and 72-76 derive patentability at least therefrom.

CLAIM 77

Applicant respectfully contends that Dantressangle does not teach subject matter recited in amended independent Claim 77. For instance, amended Claim 77 recites in part (emphasis added):

wherein once said at least one section of said test is filled out, said filled out test is returned to said testing center and used to create a test configuration file, said test configuration file comprises an automatic scheduling for testing said web based medium, said automatic scheduling comprises scheduling window information and test repetition information.

Applicant respectfully contends that Dantressangle fails to teach the test configuration file comprises an automatic scheduling for testing the web based medium, wherein the automatic scheduling comprises scheduling window information and test repetition information as

specifically recited in amended Claim 77. For example, Applicants respectfully asserts that Dantressangle fails to teach the automatic scheduling comprises scheduling window information and test repetition information. Since Dantressangle fails to teach at least one element recited in amended Claim 77, Applicants respectfully contends that Dantressangle cannot anticipate amended Claim 77. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submits that amended Claim 77 is allowable over Dantressangle.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of rejected Claims 31-56, 59-70 and 72-77.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: SEPT. 20, 2005



Thomas M. Catale
Registration No.: 46,434

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

(408) 938-9060
Facsimile: (408) 938-9069